

Appln. No. 10/582,929
Atty. Docket No. 2003B136/2
Response dated March 5, 2009
Reply to OA dated November 6, 2008

SUPPORT FOR THE AMENDMENTS

Claim 1 is amended in the body of the claim to point out and emphasize that the process of the invention is a process of conversion.

Claims 8 and 9 are amended to delete an embodiment and address the §112 rejection, as discussed below.

Claim 15 is cancelled without prejudice to the subject matter therein, solely for the purpose of not having to pay extra fees for an additional claim. This necessitated the amendment of Claim 16.

Claim 21 finds support at page 11, line 25+.

It is believed there is no possibility of new matter and entry and consideration of the amendment is respectfully requested.

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 and 16-21 are in the case.

Claim 8-9 have been amended to delete the embodiment directed to diluent. It is respectfully urged that this removes the reason for the §112 rejection and it should be withdrawn.

Certain claims have been rejected as anticipated by the Cavani et al. (Cavani) reference because Cavani's drying step technically (allegedly) reads on the originally presented claim. However, the amendments to Claim 1 are believed to overcome this rejection. The current claims define the "process" as being the conversion process. It is in the conversion process, which occurs on contact with the catalyst, wherein the amount of water is attenuated as set forth in the claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully urged that Cavani et al. does not fairly suggest the present invention, and it is requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Certain other claims have been rejected as obvious over Cavani et al. in view of WO 93/16020. It is respectfully urged that WO 93/16020 does not cure the deficiencies of Cavani et al., with regard to the new claims. That is, WO 93/16020 does not suggest that the conversion process, which occurs on contact with the catalyst, includes a reduction in the amount of water in the feed contacting the catalyst from the initiation onward. Therefore, the combination still fails to fairly suggest the present invention.

In addition, with respect to the use of zeolites in Claim 17, for which *inter alia* WO 93/16020 is applied, it is merely a guess as to whether or not the substitution of zeolites in Cavani et al. would behave in the same manner as phosphoric acid. This is not a legal basis for a rejection.

For these reasons it is respectfully requested that the rejection over Cavani et al. in view of WO 93/16020 be withdrawn.

Appln. No. 10/582,929
Atty. Docket No. 2003B136/2
Response dated March 5, 2009
Reply to OA dated November 6, 2008

There being no further issues, it is believed that the present Application is in condition for allowance and early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

March 5, 2009

Date

/Andrew B. Griffis/

Andrew B. Griffis

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 36,336

Post Office Address (to which correspondence is to be sent):
ExxonMobil Chemical Company
Law Technology Department
P.O. Box 2149
Baytown, Texas 77522-2149
Phone: (281) 834-1886
Fax: (281) 834-2495

ABG:clm